

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed on September 4, 2008 which has been reviewed and carefully considered. By means of the present amendment, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended for better clarity and to place it in better form for appeal. Accordingly, no new issues requiring a new search have been introduced and entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 11 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0099045 (Doi). Claims 2-7 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,550,657 (Tanaka). Further, claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tanaka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,568,820 (Ohkawa). It is respectfully resubmitted that claims 1-9 and 11-22 are patentable over Doi, Tanaka and Ohkawa for at least the following reasons.

Doi is directed to a panoramic imaging lens 30 shown in FIG 3.

As shown in FIG 4, the Doi panoramic imaging lens has a non-reflective part 32 on a roughened surface around a light outgoing surface 25. Assuming, arguendo, that the Doi non-reflective part 32 is equivalent to the non-random light-scattering structure recited in independent claims 1 and 11, the Doi non-reflective horizontal part 32 is in a single plane which is perpendicular to the optical axis and is a horizontal plane in FIGs 3-4 on a left and right side of the opening 28. There is no other plane or surface which is parallel to this single horizontal plane, which is perpendicular to the optical axis, and has the non-reflective part 32. That is, the non-reflective part 32 is only on a single plane which is perpendicular to the optical axis. The two vertical planes in FIGs 3-4 of Doi are in different planes, however, these two vertical planes (that form the opening 28) are not perpendicular to the optical axis; rather the two vertical planes are parallel to the optical axis.

Tanaka is directed to a back-lit reflective liquid crystal display (LCD) device that includes cold cathode tubes 21a, 21b surrounded by respective reflectors 24a, 24b, as shown in FIG 3.

As clearly shown in FIG 3, a prismatic lens film 26 is located on only a single surface which is perpendicular to the optical axis.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

a central lens element having an optical axis and located centrally of a circumjacent mounting portion having spaced parallel surfaces that extend perpendicularly to said optical axis and are in different planes,

a non-random light-scattering structure comprises indentations for coupling out light entering said mounting portion, said non-random light-scattering structure being located on said spaced parallel surfaces in the different planes.

A light light-scattering structure with indentations located spaced parallel surfaces that extend perpendicularly to the optical axis and are in different planes is nowhere taught or suggested in Doi, Tanaka, and combination thereof. Rather, the Doi non-reflective part 36 is on a single horizontal plane which is perpendicular to the optical axis, or two vertical planes which are parallel to the optical axis. Similarly, the Tanaka prism 26 is also located on only a single surface which is perpendicular to the


optical axis. Ohkawa is cited in rejecting dependent claims to allegedly show other features, and does not remedy the deficiencies of Doi and Tanaka.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 11 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-9 and 12-22 should also be allowed based at least on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 11.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
October 31, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101